



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/583,201	05/30/2000	Kendall F. Tidwell	10992479-1	1466

22879 7590 02/24/2003

HEWLETT PACKARD COMPANY
P O BOX 272400, 3404 E. HARMONY ROAD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ADMINISTRATION
FORT COLLINS, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER

MONESTIME, MACKLY

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2676

DATE MAILED: 02/24/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/583,201

Applicant(s)

TIDWELL ET AL.

Examiner

Mackly Monestime

Art Unit

2676

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 May 2000.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-23 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-23 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____.
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- ☐ Other: _____.

Art Unit: 2676

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-23 are presented for examination.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 112

2. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

3. Claims 10-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

4. As per claim 10, line 2 recites the limitation "the location". There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

5. As per claim 14, line 4 recites the limitation "said plurality of views". There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

6. As per claims 11-13, they are also rejected for incorporating the deficiencies of their base claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

Art Unit: 2676

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. Claims 1-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Diehl et al (US Patent No. 6,219,725) in view of Deering et al (US Patent No. 5,544,306).

9. As per claims 1-2, 6 and 11-12, Diehl et al substantially disclosed the invention as claimed including a system for clearing data residing in a memory region, comprising: a controller (Fig. 1, Item No. 120); and a memory coupled to said controller having said memory region subdivided into a plurality of sub-regions (Fig. 1, Item No. 130), each said sub-region comprising a plurality of storage elements (col. 3, lines 44-47).

Diehl et al did not disclose that the controller is designed to write clear data concurrently to each one of said plurality of sub-region. However, Deering et al disclosed a rendering controller (Fig. 1, Item No. 70) being able to transfer control information and perform data access to and from a plurality of FBRAM chips (Fig. 1, Item No. 71-82), and wherein the rendering controller employs color expansion and writes common color value to many pixels in the DRAM banks A-D (col. 20, lines 55-67; col. 21, lines 1-6). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have utilized the controller taught by Deering et al into the system of Diehl et al because doing so would provide a system being able to identify the data within the sub-regions so that such data may be appropriately processed by the graphics system.

Art Unit: 2676

10. As per claim 3, Diehl et al disclosed that the memory region is subdivided into consecutive and adjacent sub-regions (col. 1, lines 41-48).

11. As per claims 4-5, Diehl et al disclosed that the memory region is subdivided into sub-regions of equal dimensions and of different dimensions (col. 14, lines 61-67; col. 15, lines 1-11; col. 16, lines 7-9).

12. As per claim 7, Diehl et disclosed that the memory is a frame buffer associated with a graphics display (col. 3, lines 36-40; col. 17, lines 5-6).

13. As per claim 8, Diehl et al disclosed that the controller is a frame buffer controller (col. 4, lines 64-67).

14. As per claim 9, Diehl et al disclosed that the plurality of sub-regions are individually identified by location in said memory by a pointer register (col 18, lines 34-47).

15. As per claim 10, Diehl et al further disclosed a processor configured to determine the location of said memory region (col. 12, lines 56-67; col. 13, lines 1-7).

16. Claims 13-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Diehl et al in view of Deering et al as applied to claims 1-12 above, and in further in view of Maeda (US Patent No. 6,067,382).

17. As per claims 13-14, Diehl et al and Deering et al did not disclosed the steps of: a processor to determine dimension and a position of at least one image on said graphic display device, wherein said at least one image is to be cleared. However, Maeda disclosed a processor to determine dimension and a position of at least one image on said graphic display device, wherein

Art Unit: 2676

said at least one image is to be cleared (col. 24, lines 34-35; col. 29, lines 10-15; lines 23-40 and col. 32, lines 58-65). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the cited references because doing so would provide a system being able to identify the position and the location of the data within the sub-regions so that such data may be appropriately processed by the graphics system.

18. As per claims 15-17, 19-20 and 21, Diehl et al substantially disclosed the invention as claimed including a system for clearing data residing in a memory region, comprising: a controller (Fig. 1, Item No. 120); and a memory coupled to said controller having said memory region subdivided into a plurality of sub-regions (Fig. 1, Item No. 130), each said sub-region comprising a plurality of storage elements (col. 3, lines 44-47).

Diehl et al did not disclose that the controller is designed to write clear data concurrently to each one of said plurality of sub-region. However, Deering et al disclosed a rendering controller (Fig. 1, Item No. 70) being able to transfer control information and perform data access to and from a plurality of FBRAM chips (Fig. 1, Item No. 71-82), and wherein the rendering controller employs color expansion and writes common color value to many pixels in the DRAM banks A-D (col. 20, lines 55-67; col. 21, lines 1-6). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have utilized the controller taught by Deering et al into the system of Diehl et al because doing so would provide a system being able to identify the data within the sub-regions so that such data may be appropriately processed by the graphics system.

Art Unit: 2676

Diehl et al and Deering et al did not disclosed the steps of: a processor to determine dimension and a position of at least one image on said graphic display device, wherein said at least one image is to be cleared. However, Maeda disclosed a processor to determine dimension and a position of at least one image on said graphic display device, wherein said at least one image is to be cleared (col. 24, lines 34-35; col. 29, lines 10-15; lines 23-40 and col. 32, lines 58-65). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the cited references because doing so would provide a system being able to identify the position and the location of the data within the sub-regions so that such data may be appropriately processed by the graphics system.

19. As per claims 18 and 22; Diehl et al did not disclose the steps of associating a plurality of location identifiers wherein one location is associated with each one of said plurality of subregions residing in said frame buffer and writing clear data begins at said plurality of sub-region identified by said plurality of location identifiers. However, Deering et al disclosed a plurality of dirty tags associated to a plurality of DRAM banks; and a rendering controller employs color expansion and writes common color value to many pixels in the DRAM banks A-D (col. 19, lines 6-25; col. 20, lines 55-67; col. 21, lines 1-6). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have utilized the controller taught by Deering et al into the system of Diehl et al because doing so would provide a system being able to identify the data within the sub-regions so that such data may be appropriately processed by the graphics system.

Art Unit: 2676

20. As per claim 23, Diehl et al and Deering et al did not disclosed the steps of: a processor to determine dimension and a position of at least one image on said graphic display device, wherein said at least one image is to be cleared. However, Maeda disclosed a processor to determine dimension and a position of at least one image on said graphic display device, wherein said at least one image is to be cleared (col. 24, lines 34-35; col. 29, lines 10-15; lines 23-40 and col. 32, lines 58-65). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the cited references because doing so would provide a system being able to identify the position and the location of the data within the sub-regions so that such data may be appropriately processed by the graphics system.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mackly Monestime whose telephone number is (703) 305-3855. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Thursday from 7:30 AM to 6:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Matthew Bella, can be reached on (703) 308-6829.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patent and Trademarks

Washington, D.C. 20231

or faxed to:

Art Unit: 2676

Washington, D.C. 20231

or faxed to:

(703) 872-9314 (for Technology Center 2600 only)

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive,
Arlington, Va, Sixth Floor (Receptionist).


Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding
should be directed to the Technology Center 2600 Customer Service Office whose telephone
number is (703) 306-0377.

Mackly Monestime



Patent Examiner

February 13, 2003



MATTHEW C. BELLA
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600